DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 905 SP 036 508

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | England, David A. |
| TITLE | Teacher Education Program Reviews at University of North Florida, Florida State University, Florida Atlantic University, University of South Florida, March 1994-April 1995. |
| INSTITUTION | State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee. Board of Regents. |
| REPORT NO | BOR-94-1 |
| PUB DATE | Aug 95 |
| NOTE | 91p.; For previous reports, see ED 355 200 and SP 036 507. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC04 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Accreditation (Institutions); *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Master Plans; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Schools of Education; *State Standards; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Education Programs; Universities |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Florida; Florida Atlantic University; Florida State University; *State University System of Florida; University of North Florida; University of South Florida |

ABSTRACT

This report offers the review of four joint teacher education reviews conducted in the Florida State University System (SUS). Institutions reviewed are: University of North Florida (UNF), Florida State University (FSU), Florida Atlantic University (FAU), and the University of South Florida (USF). Joint teams were composed of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Board of Examiners members, the Florida Department of Education (DOE) Unit Review Team members and DOE staff, and the Board of Regents (BOR) consultant and BOR staff. Teams reviewed written self-study materials and reports provided by each teacher preparation program and conducted a site visit to each institution. An initial report (1992) offered ten recommendations focusing on academic programs, teacher certification programs, master plan goals, and preparation for national accreditation. A second report (March 1994) offered an additional recommendation concerning the establishment of a strong financial support base for the clinical training component of the teacher preparation programs. The four reports in this presentation assess the strength and effectiveness of the four colleges and their teacher preparation programs, evaluate the extent to which the colleges are addressing systemwide issues in teacher education, determine the progress made on previous recommendations, and outline recommendations for improving the current teacher preparation programs. Appendices include the academic degree programs inventory, joint review teams personnel listing, and vita of the BOR consultant. (NAV)

ED 394 905

# Teacher Education Program Reviews

March 1994 - April 1995

State University System of Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Rackliff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State University System of Florida

# Teacher Education Program Reviews

at

University of North Florida

Florida State University

Florida Atlantic University

University of South Florida

March, 1994 - April, 1995

Consultant's Report and Recommendations
by
David A. England, Ph.D.
Louisiana State University

Authorized and Coordinated
by
Board of Regents Office
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

August, 1995

# TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEWS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


**Introduction** . . . . . 1

**Individual University Reviews** . . . . . 3

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA** - March 20-23, 1994 . . . . . 5
- General Overview and Introduction . . . . . 7
- College Linkages, Governance, and Articulation . . . . . 9
- The Florida Institute of Education . . . . . 12
- The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership . . . . . 14
- Other Issues . . . . . 18
- Summary . . . . . 21
- Recommendations . . . . . 22

**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY** - December 4-7, 1994 . . . . . 25
- General Overview and Introduction . . . . . 27
- Issues of Recurring Interest to the Board of Regents . . . . . 27
- Areas of Commendation . . . . . 32
- Areas of Concern . . . . . 34
- Recommendations . . . . . 38

**FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY** - April 9-12, 1995 . . . . . 41
- General Overview and Introduction . . . . . 43
- Commendations: Signs of Health and Vitality . . . . . 44
- Progress since Last BOR Report and Efforts to Address Other BOR Concerns . . . . . 47
- Areas of Concern . . . . . 50
- Recommendations . . . . . 55

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA** - April 23-26, 1995 . . . . . 57
- General Overview and Introduction . . . . . 59
- BOR Accountability Issues . . . . . 60
- Areas of Commendation . . . . . 61
- Areas of Concern . . . . . 66
- Recommendations . . . . . 70

**A General Recommendation for State Universities in Florida** . . . . . 73

**Appendices** . . . . . 77

**APPENDIX A: Academic Degree Programs Inventory** . . . . . 79

**APPENDIX B: Teacher Education Joint Review Teams** . . . . . 83

APPENDIX B-1 - UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
Teacher Education Program Review Personnel . . . . . 85
APPENDIX B-2 - FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
Teacher Education Program Review Personnel . . . . . 87
APPENDIX B-3 - FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
Teacher Education Program Review Personnel . . . . . 89
APPENDIX B-4 - UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
Teacher Education Program Review Personnel . . . . . 91

**APPENDIX C: Vita - Dr. David A. England**
**Board of Regents Consultant** . . . . . 93

## Introduction

During the past twenty years, the State University System (SUS) of Florida has conducted over sixty systemwide reviews of academic programs. These reviews initially were conducted under a 1975 Board of Regents (BOR) policy that required periodic review of all authorized degree programs to confirm that they met standards of quality, efficient management, and optimum service to their intended clients and the citizenry of Florida. Subsequent to implementation of the Board policy, Florida Statute 240.2095 was enacted, placing the review of SUS academic programs into law in the State of Florida.

Additional program review requirements were implemented for teacher education programs in the SUS. In accordance with Florida Statute 240.529, SUS teacher preparation units were required to seek individual program approval from the Florida Department of Education (DOE) and accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

In an attempt to reduce costs and duplication of effort, the BOR, the DOE, and NCATE initiated a comprehensive and collaborative joint review process for SUS teacher preparation programs in 1990. This effort represented the first tripartite review of teacher education programs in the United States; no other state had integrated its national accreditation, state program approval, and degree authorization and monitoring procedures for teacher preparation programs. The resulting partnership has helped conserve resources, eliminate much unnecessary paperwork, reduce the number of reviews required, and maintain a high quality system of teacher preparation in the State of Florida.

From March, 1994, though April, 1995, four joint teacher education reviews were conducted in the SUS, including reviews of programs at the University of North Florida (UNF), Florida State University (FSU), Florida Atlantic University (FAU), and the University of South Florida (USF). Joint teams consisted of (1) NCATE Board of Examiners members, (2) DOE Unit Review Team members and DOE staff; and (3) the BOR consultant, Dr. David A. England, and BOR staff. The teams reviewed written self-study materials and reports provided by each teacher preparation program, and conducted a site visit to each institution.

Separate reports have been filed by the NCATE Board of Examiners Teams and the DOE Unit Review Teams. The following four reports, submitted by Dr. David A. England, assess the strength and effectiveness of the four colleges and their teacher preparation programs; evaluate the extent to which the colleges are addressing systemwide issues in teacher education; determine progress made on recommendations from the last series of program reviews; and outline recommendations for improving the teacher preparation programs.

# Individual University Reviews

# UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

**March 20-23, 1994**

## General Overview and Introduction

The University of North Florida (UNF) is a maturing institution which has made its place in the local and regional environment. The University's missions to serve the region and to provide high quality undergraduate education have so far mutually benefitted the University and northeast Florida. The University will likely be in a transition phase over the next few years. The University of North Florida has survived its formative years and growing pains. At the same time, this institution has profited from the patience and concessions granted to young institutions. In the next few years, UNF will sit more and more as an equal among the state's middle-tier institutions. In the meantime, how UNF responds to reconsidering and/or renewing its missions in a state with less-than-adequate support for higher education will force some hard decisions and necessitate some careful planning.

In several important ways, the faculty and administration continue to perceive North Florida as a young, emerging institution. In a literal sense, this point is only relatively true. In an operational and perceptual sense, this view could prove disadvantageous and ill-advised if it persists too far into the future. The University of North Florida should not continue using its relative youth to explain away problems or to excuse a lack of intra-university articulation.

UNF's President at once affirms and demonstrates an institutional commitment to serve the local area. He is very active in the local community. The College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) has notable relationships, programs, and research in local schools which are compatible with the institution's mission and President's emphasis. At the undergraduate level especially, the institution draws high percentages of students from the local community.

Such evidences of devotion to local impact and service, however, suggest one of several interesting tensions likely to emerge for this institution over the next several years. To be visible in the local community is one matter; to have real impact on the overall health and vitality of a region through research, service, and development suggests agendas which transcend visibility. Providing faculty time for research, sustained service activity, and community-based development activities will be prerequisite to any expanded, community-based initiatives.

Certainly one plausible scenario would have the expressed commitment to serve the region expand as the University matures. If that is the case, will enrollment be limited to allow faculty time for more outreach efforts, or will more faculty be hired? How will a more proactive, expanded service orientation be reconciled with a concomitant emphasis on undergraduate education? How will quality undergraduate education be maintained with the same faculty resources, especially if more faculty become aggressive and active in local service, research, and development agendas? How will the University elect to use its resources (stable, at best, in recent years) to justify future outreach programs and initiatives in light of declining enrollments in key areas--including the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS)?

The anticipated decentralized decision-making process may raise its own set of tensions which may be tied into an expanded service mission. How will increased decision making at the college level impact: (1) resource allocation? (2) goodness of fit between COEHS goals and institutional visions? (3) competing definitions of "visibility"? (Will it mean serving more students and offering more programs, or will it mean channeling resources to support outreach

initiatives?) Serving more students could mean adding graduate programs, lowering admission requirements to undergraduate programs, or seeking new populations through innovative initiatives. Questions and issues such as these are likely to be forefronted in the near future.

Institutional stress driven by such questions may be very healthy. If clarity of purpose is achieved through dialogue, trust at all levels up and down the line, and a consistent, engaged anticipation of a clear mission for the future, positive tensions should be productive. Conversely, without clarity, consistency, and dialogue as these and related issues are addressed, the University (and perhaps, especially, the College of Education and Human Services) will suffer from unproductive, unresolved tensions.

Within this general institutional context, three issues of particular importance for the Dean and the COEHS are emerging: (l) college linkages, articulation with the central administration, and internal governance; (2) achieving maximum benefits from the Florida Institute of Education; and (3) maturation of and emphasis on the COEHS doctorate in Educational Leadership. The following text addresses each of these broader issues. A miscellany of other, less central and portentous issues will be briefly considered.

## College Linkages, Governance, and Articulation

The College of Education and Human Services has formed some strong linkages to local schools, and works well with local community colleges. However, clear, formalized linkages with other departments within the University are less apparent.

Public school linkages are primarily between faculty who have funded projects in the schools and personnel in those schools. On the other hand, broader participation of public school teachers and administration in the COEHS administrative decision-making loop and in

curriculum planning activities seems to be lacking. The College of Education and Human Services operates without a conventional "Teacher Education Council." Consequently, the Dean and, through the Dean, the University central administration as well, do not optimally access broadly based perspectives on teacher education. A "Teacher Education Council" would give public school personnel a valuable voice in College affairs. Missed opportunities brought about by the COEHS not involving public school constituents in curriculum planning and implementation surfaced during the site visit. For example, local school administrators were not conspicuously included in planning the Educational Leadership doctorate to be discussed below.

Lack of articulation between the COEHS and the University central administration is creating situations which are much, much more problematic. The lack of COEHS participation in budget and planning decisions has had deleterious consequences. For example, the College has responded to central administration budgeting (based on enrollment projections which are primarily historical) in a consistent and unfortunate manner. According to data presented in the COEHS Institutional Report prepared for NCATE (pp. 252-253), the percentage of course sections offered by full-time faculty is relatively low. It has not been unusual in recent years for adjunct and part-time faculty to provide the instruction in up to 40% of the course sections offered. Given a fixed budget and perhaps unrealistic enrollment projections, cost-per-course efficiency has been the apparent order of the day. With nearly one-fourth of the total faculty being of part-time and adjunct status, cost efficiency, if nothing else, is achieved. Though this is especially true in the summer school budgeting process, the same mind-set is reflected in and has impact on academic year planning as well.

It is not clear whether the College of Education and Human Services has done systematic planning to maximize the value of greater participation in the budget process, even if such participation were allowed. However, when top-down enrollment projections have been made without reflecting College resource realities, the College has from all accounts been relatively defenseless. At the same time, were planning and budgeting done in a more rational, participatory manner, the College may find itself without a support structure for sound College-level planning and budgeting. It is not certain that the COEHS has anticipated either the personnel needs or the internal governance mechanisms for sound planning.

This concern is especially important if the central administration follows through on an expressed intent to decentralize. The new Vice President for Academic Affairs seems committed to having college deans significantly more involved in budget and planning processes. Hence, new opportunities for self-governance and self-determination may well present themselves to the COEHS Dean and her department chairs. If and when that becomes an operational reality, a parallel mandate for sound College-wide and departmental planning comes with it.

The University at large and the College of Education and Human Services are now in a position to profit--even greatly--from more clarified, publicized, and rational institutional planning. Promising new personnel in budget and planning offices will be advising the President and his Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Administration and Planning and the Executive Director of Planning and Evaluation will be key players. They appear committed to providing new planning assumptions, reconsidered budgeting paradigms, more rational expectations for enrollments, and better information to the colleges.

Institutional support services to facilitate program and budget planning at the college level may be forthcoming. Such support would be clearly advantageous to the College of Education and Human Services.

## The Florida Institute of Education

This Institute appears to be a sleeping giant of financial and research advantage to the University of North Florida. The Institute has been beset by problems and misperceptions including a lack of consistent leadership at the top; role ambiguity and something approaching suspicion within the COEHS; lack of success in tying into the University's service commitment, or to the COEHS's relatively strong research and development presence in the schools; and its own inability to set forth and pursue over time a clear, state-wide mission appropriate to a Type I institute.

New, experienced, and potentially aggressive leadership is promising. However, the current situation not only carries the historical problems noted above, but also an emerging challenge as well for the Institute's new leadership to anticipate. The Institute could become a political football--one that several groups and agencies may or may not want to claim and support depending on its success and visibility. The Department of Education will have some rightful claim and its own set of expectations. The Board of Regents has a strong, vested, and justifiable interest in the Institute's operations. The state's education deans could well act as if the Institute were their own extension. The University of North Florida could stake its own claim and expectations.

These various and vested interests need not be problematic, and could, in fact, work to the Institute's advantage. The Institute would be well advised to construct a meaningful

governance structure, be sensitive to political tensions which may increase with its increased impact, and seek the right alliances and cooperation among agencies and groups which could enhance the Institute's work.

Secondly, the Institute must determine where its locus of activity will be. Will the Institute devote itself to fostering a University-based network of research and development activities? Or, will it focus more on developing a state-wide network of non-university sites as its recent extension-related initiatives might suggest? Ideally, the leadership will find ways to maximize the benefits of both organizational patterns.

Now, if only these challenges could be met, this potentially powerful player in state education, research, and development could have significant impact. It is arguable that the Institute could develop and profit much from closer collaborative work with the University of North Florida COEHS. The College does have a reasonable research and development agenda ongoing, one that could be expanded with more resources. Through brokering for larger, more omnibus grants through state and federal agencies, the Institute could establish North Florida as the lead institution in grants and contracts with state-wide participation, buy-in, and benefits. The fact that this Institute is at the back door of the COEHS could benefit both the College and the Institute.

Possible linkages with and tie-ins to the Educational Leadership doctoral program are similarly pregnant with possibilities. Emerging research strength and visibility from both the faculty who serve the program and the students who enroll in it could at once serve and be served by the Institute's presence and potential. On a broader scale, the President's far-reaching service vision is clearly tied to fostering economic development. There appears to

be a strong, concomitant impulse to define "education" quite broadly within the Institute. Yet, just how the President's regional leadership initiatives could be combined with the Institute's planning has evidently not been fully explored.

Much can be gained as the Institute works more closely with University grants and contracts personnel. For example, larger grants could include opportunities for faculty release time, soft money funding for new faculty lines, and other financial enhancements for the COEHS's own research and development (e.g., travel, equipment, etc.).

These closer working relationships within the UNF communities would likely strengthen, rather than preclude, broader operations with other higher education institutions and agencies throughout the state. There must be some center for the Institute's activities--a consistent contributor, supporter, and collaborator. UNF should take the initiative for becoming the lead institutional agency. "Lead agency" as used here is not meant to suggest governance and administration; rather, it is to suggest a center of the greatest activity. Unless UNF becomes recognized as that lead academic institution, the Florida Institute of Education may not realize its full potential for the state, let alone for the University of North Florida. Much brighter and more promising scenarios are easy to imagine, and may not be so terribly difficult to achieve.

## The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

This promising new program has much to recommend it. The enthusiastic and energetic commitment of the Educational Leadership faculty is appealing and important. Support and involvement of faculty outside the College of Education and Human Services is encouraging. This doctoral program has especially well-defined application procedures and requirements

and attracts high quality students. Students seem appreciative and aware of faculty efforts in their behalf and praise the cohort group support network in which they are well engaged. The first cohort now has nine students preparing for program completion, and they, like the students who come behind them, speak in generally positive terms about the quality, rigor, and appropriateness of their doctoral studies.

One major constellation of problems and several minor, potentially troublesome ones were evident during the site visit. The most serious problems have to do with the appointment, recognition, and support of a graduate faculty to serve a doctoral program. The fact that the University does not have a clearly defined graduate school construct is perhaps forgivable at this point given its undergraduate emphasis and this single doctoral program. However, that does not excuse the College of Education and Human Services' lack of compliance with its own graduate faculty appointment criteria and procedures listed on page 8 of its March, 1992 Faculty Handbook.

Because these or similar procedures are not in operation, designation as "graduate faculty" does not currently mean much at this institution--a problem exacerbated, of course, with the emergence of a doctoral program. What being on the graduate faculty does mean, how graduate faculty status is monitored, and who is invited onto--and, with clear and high expectations, who may be invited off of--such a faculty must be clarified.

Since the designation "graduate faculty" is operationally without meaning, the College has not been situated to address graduate faculty load considerations. Without load reconsideration, past due now with the advent of the doctoral program, the following could be among several academically unhealthy prospects: (1) doctoral students may not be served

well; (2) the faculty may pay inadequate attention to other teaching responsibilities (including the ongoing master's programs, which may be at particular risk of compromised quality); or (3) faculty members may have little time for their own ongoing research (a basic prerequisite for graduate faculty status).

The fact that there is an emerging, vital doctoral program in the College of Education and Human Services must become a budgeting and planning reality. The Educational Leadership doctorate has a high number of courses required of all students. These courses are not designed for, nor likely to attract, more than a maximum of 15-20 students. Like most good doctoral programs, the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership is not likely to be a high FTE producer. However, as a quality doctoral program, this one will continue to be labor intensive. These realities must become important considerations in staffing decisions, in budgeting, and in academic planning.

The University commitment to support the Educational Leadership doctorate must be sustaining. When enrollment and revenue targets (as discussed above) are determined, this doctoral program will have to be recognized in special ways. That will necessitate thoughtful load analysis which, in turn, begins with careful attention to graduate faculty definitions and responsibilities.

The Educational Leadership doctorate (like the University in which it resides) is moving from its infancy toward maturation. Here are three other issues, challenges, and opportunities which might be anticipated as the program matures:

(l) Prescriptive definitions of too many core courses limits planning flexibility and individualization. For example, all students have to take the same estimable block of research

courses, regardless of their backgrounds, needs or personal preferences and talents, or their likely research paradigm. Having more general research expectations (with choices from among options) might be considered.

Doing so would have the added advantage of perhaps freeing up hours for similarly flexible attention to technology--not at all an emphasized area in the current design. The faculty may wish to consider how to ensure that program graduates leave with the skills necessary to access world-wide information networks, institutional data sets, and contemporary research and report publishing capabilities from a faculty or administrative desk.

(2) It is interesting to note that a fairly sizable percentage of master's students come to North Florida from out of state. However, the Educational Leadership doctoral program has thus far recruited primarily from a rather localized population. Parochialism could become a danger, especially if the program's graduates consistently return to the local positions they had before embarking on the program.

Unfortunately, without the ability to provide some financial assistance, more ambitious recruiting efforts will be frustrated. Funding both research and teaching graduate assistantships could be a key to recruitment success. Plus, supporting graduate assistants in return for their services would have other academic advantages for the COEHS. Research assistants would enhance and reward the efforts of faculty engaged in the most significant and sustained scholarship (a graduate faculty boon!). Perhaps even more importantly for this institution, <u>teaching</u> assistantships could be offered to qualified doctoral students. A well-supported pool of teaching assistants could offer undergraduate instruction at least at the level offered now by the plethora of adjuncts and part-time faculty.

(3) Students felt very positively about the cohort bonding. Certainly strong, supportive professional networks can enhance group and individual development. A doctoral program which emphasizes cohort formation must work to stress professionalization while at the same time minimizing insularity. Cohorts made up of students from the same geographic region must take special care to ensure that wider perspectives are solicited and entertained. Even when a cohort is comprised primarily of students from a particular region, horizons can be broadened and professionalization can be increased through early involvement with major research associations such as American Educational Research Association. Such encouragement was not evident.

## Other Issues

"Blueprint 2000." The State University System College of Education deans may, as a group, wish to make their commitments, capabilities, and visions somewhat more explicit in response to "Blueprint 2000." For example, the deans may see particular opportunities to be articulated in regard to Goal Six, Working Assumption 4. Clear expectations and opportunities for colleges of education are not pronounced in "Blueprint 2000." This lack of clarity may work to the deans' advantage, particularly if they decide to forge their own appropriate agendas for teacher education which support and enable the broader initiatives of "Blueprint 2000."

Some of those agendas--perhaps conceptualized from the outset as action plans--might be commonly assumed by all SUS institutions. Other plans and responses might be institution-specific. For example, there may be some special opportunities for the University of North Florida to broker some initiatives--especially through the close collaboration with the Florida

Institute of Education advocated above. Technology presents another area of potential activity. The need to produce a technologically literate society permeates "Blueprint 2000" though, some would offer, not quite as pervasively as it should. Technology is currently far from a strength in the University of North Florida College of Education and Human Services, but it could become a point of new emphasis and impetus as the College seeks specific and needed ways to address the goals of the Florida Commission's school improvement system.

High Hours/Low Completers. Both issues are largely administrative and will require periodic monitoring to ensure satisfactory resolution. The first of these issues is being adequately addressed judging from the evidence presented. Several programs have exceeded the 128-credit-hour limit and have hence been out of compliance with BOR Accountability Measures. An informative discussion with the Director of the Office of Student Services suggested that the College has taken this concern seriously, and, in some cases, has already succeeded in reducing credit hours required. In other cases, proposals and recommendations are either under consideration or being developed to bring all programs into compliance, or as close to compliance as possible. How hours are counted, some reporting errors, and some confusion about what hours are really required for all students have combined to make the situation appear worse than it actually is.

There does seem to be somewhat more cause for concern about the College's response to the figures regarding low program completers. There is less reason to believe the College has presented a clear or accurate picture in its initial response to the BOR. Some rationale is provided for continuing to offer low completer programs in fields with high demands for teachers, specifically in mathematics and science. But the College also has claimed

"elimination" of other programs still clearly on the books, both institutionally and in the BOR record. The BOR should expect much more clarification in regard to this inquiry. A program-by-program response from the institution to ascertain the status and plan for each program currently under-producing is recommended.

Continuing Vitality of Undergraduate Programs. Maintaining the quality focus on undergraduate programs may not be as easy for this institution in the future as it has been in the past. In fact, perhaps it should not be as easy. The prospect of declining enrollments is real. Competition by neighboring institutions for marginalized students is strong. Budgeting seems reducible to a cost-per-course analysis predicated on large sections taught by the cheapest possible instructors. A University cannot pride itself on quality undergraduate education--nor, in good faith, use that quality argument as a recruiting tool--when one-fourth of the sections it offers are not taught by full-time faculty.

Tightening budgets could challenge and erode the President's institutional vision of being particularly caring. How long will the University be able to support its currently well-funded, campus-wide and COEHS student services commitment? What new pressures might these support personnel have to face from students in larger and larger classes with a highly transient faculty? If UNF is to grow, it may need to transcend regionalism and, to do this, an exclusive devotion to undergraduate education may not be the best route. Will the University recruit an increasingly cosmopolitan faculty which may, in turn, place a higher value on research and seek supportive external funding? What will the University support to ensure: (1) a more stable tier of qualified undergraduate faculty? (2) vital and dynamic undergraduate program planning? (3) forward-seeking undergraduate curriculum development?

(4) progressive delivery of undergraduate instruction (especially characterized by technologically enhanced learning experiences)? The adage that "if you keep doing what you are doing you will keep getting what you are getting" does not apply here. Another adage from the advertising world does pertain: (in undergraduate education) "you either lead or you fall behind."

As the future challenge of maintaining the quality of undergraduate education confronts the University, it will confront the College of Education and Human Services with equal import and will require equal imagination and planning. In one regard, the challenge may be especially complex in the College of Education and Human Services, given its recent and justifiable embracing of the new doctoral program.

**Summary**

A central theme permeates this report: the University of North Florida must engage in much more systematic, participatory, and sound budgeting and planning processes. Part of doing this should accentuate the relationship between budgeting and planning. Doing so will improve the quality of undergraduate teacher education. Doing so will enable definition of a graduate faculty. Doing so will reveal advantageous linkages to the Florida Institute of Education. Finally, doing so will require new support networks, staff and administrative orientation, and a much greater sense of trust, sharing, and autonomy in this institution's budgeting and planning processes.

The University of North Florida is now too far removed from its infancy to further abide a proprietary, paternalistic, and centralized control of resources and opportunities. Its future (and, perhaps most particularly, the future of the College) will hinge on how successfully the



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University can move into its maturity with sound budgeting and planning. Saying, "We do not have enough" will no longer suffice. No one has enough in higher education these days, and, all things considered, this institution has not, over the last three to five years, fared too badly.

The greatest challenge for UNF will be to plan well enough to use what it does have to optimum advantage. That is no more or no less true for UNF than it is for most other universities. The disconcerting news is that there are many miles to go before this is achieved at UNF. There is good news and promise, however: now in view are some signs of promising institutional potential and commitment toward the goal of better budgeting and planning. For that potential to be met, the commitment must be sustained.

## Recommendations

This report is replete with implicit and explicit recommendations at varying levels of specificity and emphasis. The following four synthesize several from the text, and summarize the most important:

1. The College of Education and Human Services should participate much more directly in budgeting and planning decisions that affect its future; should be provided adequate and timely planning information; and should be required to propose a plan (to appropriate central administration personnel) for better handling of its own fiscal and academic planning destiny.

2. The COEHS should forge the strongest possible links to the Florida Institute of Education. A joint task force of FIE leadership, COEHS leadership, and central administration representatives should be convened as soon as possible to bring this about.

3. The Educational Leadership doctoral program should be the primary domain of a clearly delineated and carefully selected graduate faculty and should, in the short run, have an immediately reconstituted graduate faculty designated through appointments by the Dean; should seek ways to provide graduate assistantship support; and should submit to the Dean a thorough "cycle one" review of its core course construct, with alternatives considered.

4. The College of Education and Human Services should draft, for the Vice President of Academic Affairs, a three-year plan for excellence in undergraduate teacher education. This plan may feature, but not be limited to, such concerns as quality of faculty and infusion of technology.

# FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

**December 4-7, 1994**

## General Overview and Introduction

Florida State University's College of Education (COE) has earned a seemingly well-deserved, positive reputation throughout the state, region, and nation. A traditionally demonstrable commitment to teacher education is evidenced by individually strong (and, in some cases, almost unequalled) enclaves of faculty strength in curriculum and instruction core areas. These areas historically have included math, science, English, and social studies education. However, academic programs for the most part remain rather traditional; one would not characterize the program or curricular environment at Florida State as being particularly dynamic.

Resources continue to be sufficient for the delivery of quality programs, though this institution is like every other public institution in the South: not even the best fiscal management will stave off the cumulative effects of limited budgets for much longer. The College of Education has done well in competition for grants and contracts.

Understanding the context for this visit would be incomplete without some sense of this institution's preparation for joint review opportunity. This consultant's general sense was that the institution's orientation toward and preparation for the joint review was inconsistent. The impression was that reviews are seen as unnecessary inconveniences to be endured rather than opportunities to thoughtfully document unit strengths, structures, rationales, and plans.

## Issues of Recurring Interest to the Board of Regents

Credit hours to degree. In the Teacher Education Program Review (Board of Regents Addendum), the College of Education reported that 138 credit hours are required in the Visually Impaired (K-12) + Mobility Program. This total was corrected to 128 hours in

revisions to the BOR Addendum. Music education remains perhaps necessarily high at 140-142 hours, a total not out of line with other institutions, and reflective of both K-12 and performance demands. Two other areas exceeding 128 hours are Art at 130 hours and Home Economics at 132 hours. Both similarly prepare students to work at multiple school levels.

Pass rates on professional licensure examinations. Only eight of 35 subject areas reported less than 80% passing rate on subject area examinations, and all eight of those programs had five or fewer scores reported. What that means is not clear, though it does suggest that in these few areas, some special attention is warranted to ensure higher success rates. More significant, perhaps, and certainly more indicative of overall test preparation of the unit's students, are the very high pass rates in high-productivity programs. These would include elementary education, English education, music education, special learning disabilities, and numerous others with well over 90% pass rates.

Accomplished practices. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee in the College of Education expressed some familiarity with the "accomplished practices" outlined by the Florida Educational Standards Commission (ESC). Discussions of how the ESC's directions would impact programs appeared to be just beginning. One concern is that, without better coordination of the unit's various programs, implementation of plans to move toward more performance-based measures may be uneven and unmonitored. The College of Education must organize and assess compliance--and thereby point the way toward progressive, contemporary program development in keeping with national trends in program design and outcome assessment.

Minority recruitment, enrollment, and graduation from teacher education programs. Trend data show that the College of Education has significantly increased (by 50% or more) the number of undergraduate African-Americans over the past ten years. However, the percentage of African-American graduate level program completers has remained constant and is not impressive. Whereas there has been an increase in the number of Hispanic program completers at the graduate level, that increase has not been matched in undergraduate programs.

The Teacher Education for America's Minorities (TEAM) project is attracting African-American undergraduate students, and FSU's leadership in this multi-campus project is commendable. It was noted that a number of African-Americans who are involved in the TEAM project, or who have matriculated from it, do not show up in counts of "approved program" enrollments or completers. This is because they have been enrolled in alternative certification programs which are evidently recognized by the state, though not "approved programs."

There did not appear to be evidence that the professional education unit (as defined by NCATE) was working in a concerted, coordinated manner to attract and retain students from various cultures (Hispanic, Asian, etc.) across all program levels. Hence, it would be hard to argue that, except for the TEAM project, major, sustained efforts were underway to increase minority recruitment, enrollment, and graduation.

Limited access programs. The 2.5 GPA required for entry into teacher education programs serves to limit access. The fact that Special Education is, in addition, a program with a "capped" enrollment warrants analysis since the state needs more, not fewer, special

education teachers. With careful planning, perhaps resources could be shifted from elementary education (where it might be justified to cap enrollment) to special education and similar areas of teacher shortage.

However, it does not appear that either the College of Education or the Professional Education Unit does much planning beyond making year-to-year budgeting decisions and responding to various state mandates. Without such analysis and planning that this example calls for, it is difficult to determine how resources might best be directed to high-need program areas.

University-public school collaboration. One gets the general sense that there is fairly frequent and widespread collaboration. However, the examples cited in various sources of evidence rarely included faculty in professional teacher education from departments outside the College of Education. It was noted, too, that the representatives from the local schools who were added to the Teacher Education Advisory Committee were added only last spring.

Leadership as a programmatic focus. Preparing educational leaders is the professed focus of the unit's programs at both the basic and advanced levels. Accordingly, program and course emphasis on leadership should be pervasive, conspicuous, and well-documented. Such was not the case. Students were unable to identify leadership as a program goal, let alone as a program focus. Faculty were vague in providing course examples of any leadership emphasis. A promising and much needed devotion to leadership preparation for all school professionals is currently little more than a motto. This is particularly regrettable given the claims made for the importance of leadership development at FSU.

Institutes and centers. FSU's ability to attract and support a variety of active, significant, and well-directed institutes and centers is commendable. Four examples will be briefly reported on here. The Center for Women in Higher Education is a modest but effective effort to support involvement of and research related to women in higher education. Through both internal and external means, some 28 women are receiving financial support to continue their education and conduct research through this center's activities.

The Center for Policy Studies in Education is much larger and more varied in goals and activities. Recent activities include grants and contracts in adult education, community development, and the juvenile justice system. An international study of street children has recently been sponsored by the United Nations. A number of projects are sustained simultaneously each year.

The Center for the Study of Technology in Counseling and Career Education might first suggest a very limited focus. However, this center conducts well-recognized research and dissemination on the most current, technologically enhanced means of career counseling. This center provides an interesting example of a specific, well-defined, and limited set of goals being pursued with particular distinction and recognition.

The Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning evidently enjoys a well-earned reputation for doing good work in a variety of areas. This center has been successful in landing major, highly competitive grants, including Ford Foundation funding for the TEAM Project. In addition to a history of attracting major grants and contracts, the Center continues to successfully negotiate and deliver numerous smaller, service contracts for local and regional school districts and agencies.

Several other institutes and centers are listed for FSU, some of which include direct or indirect participation by faculty in its professional education unit. These four, however, seemed especially germane and most directly related to the College of Education. It is significant to note that these centers and institutes are sustained in such a manner that regular academic programs do not appear to suffer.

## Areas of Commendation

The College of Education specifically, and, to a lesser extent, the Professional Education Unit at Florida State University, exhibit several areas of commendable strengths. The first of these is the visibility, research and publication productivity, and general quality of the faculty. As noted above, FSU has earned a strong, national reputation for the visibility of its teacher education faculty. The ability of this faculty to secure grants and contracts compares quite favorably to other faculties in other units and colleges. The faculty as a whole can list an impressive number of publications over the last few years. One mild enjoinder in this area might be to emphasize the quality of publications over the sheer numbers of publications cited. This would be in keeping with a national trend that fewer publications in more prestigious research journals is likely to garner more acclaim in future accountings of faculty quality.

Faculty activity and leadership in state and national professional associations is to be commended.

The Florida State University School (FSUS) is excellent. Particularly obvious is the research agenda of the faculty, as well as similar and corollary evidences that the developmental research school faculty is well connected to the College of Education. The

emerging plans for a joint venture to create a technologically advanced "Knowledge Center" could well become the envy of many institutions. The high quality leadership the FSUS has enjoyed over the last decade is clear. The fact that this school has been allowed to operate free from political pressure in regard to its admissions policies is as worthy of praise as it is unusual for such university-linked collaboratives. The role and potential of the developmental research school should be highlighted in long-range planning.

The strength of centers and institutes mentioned above is a third area deserving further comment. Each center especially reviewed for this visit exhibits research productivity, support of graduate students, and service to the state, region, and nation. Once again, the maximization of the various centers and institutes, and their inclusion and enhancement in long-range planning, will only extend their value and impact.

New and much needed attention to the ways technology can advance programs in the College and serve its preparation of school professionals is beginning to emerge. A recently activated committee to assess the technological needs within the College holds great promise. Whereas reasonably current and sufficient technological resources are available, their impact on programs and on the preparation of teachers will be strengthened as this committee continues its work. Recent funding for competitive faculty grants to infuse technology in instruction is a positive sign. As the College develops long-range plans to devote adequate resources for implementing plans just now emerging, it can sustain the current emphasis.

Lastly, but of perhaps central import, are administrative directions currently emerging in the College of Education. Clearly, the participatory role of faculty in College governance and decision-making is potentially much greater than it has been in the past. Faculty recognize a

demonstrated commitment to decentralized governance. There are signs that budget decisions may be increasingly guided by agreed upon and negotiated priorities within the College of Education. A much needed culture change may well be underway--a culture change that may have the faculty more trusting of administration, and less exclusively devoted to the concerns of individual program advancement.

## Areas of Concern

FSU must create a stronger, more unified and coordinated governance structure for the various programs in its professional education unit. That unit, as it exists now, is only minimally defined. The Council on Teacher Education appears to play a rather pro forma coordinating and monitoring role in curriculum matters. This committee's potential--and the need to activate such potential--is, however, significantly greater.

Though the unit claims to have adopted a unit-wide knowledge base and program design, evidence of their impact was lacking throughout the professional education programs. Coordinated governance, more integrated decision-making, and more widely shared implementation strategies are essential to the adaptation of a unit-wide approach to professional preparation. The Professional Education Unit at FSU lacks such coordinated unit governance and administration. This makes a shared vision, planning, and meaningful follow-up studies impossible.

Where is the College heading? How does it want to be characterized and defined as it moves toward the 2lst Century? What role does the College want to play as a major participant in professional preparation among Florida's institutions? What new initiatives will it undertake? What programs or goals or orientations will it adopt and espouse and pursue?

How will the College and the unit plan to address the "Blueprint 2000" agendas systematically? Not only must these questions be answered by the College of Education, the COE must provide the framing leadership for the professional education unit. At FSU, this includes multiple stake-holders and participants in the professional education of those who will work in schools.

A clearly expressed and broadly shared vision for the College and the unit can only result from careful, systematic, sustained, and monitored long-range planning. Will the emphasis be on preparing leaders for the public schools? If so, what steps will be taken to programmatically demonstrate that--or any other--emphasis? How much emphasis will the College place on research? Service? On educating only high quality, selectively admitted students across programs and degree levels? What will be the roles of centers and institutes, of the developmental research school, of an agenda for technologically advanced instruction?

These are basic and fundamental questions that will require a single, clear, and agreed-upon mission. Simply stated, this College of Education--and the constituent programs that should make up the professional education unit--must determine priorities and goals. Where does the College want to go? What plans will be made for getting there? How will a College vision guide the now only loosely confederated unit of professional education? And upon what should these plans be based?

At least a partial answer to the last question must be sought from carefully designed follow-up studies. It is true that five-year, university mandated reviews of doctoral programs did involve some follow-up studies and assessment. It is also true that, since 1985, the College has conducted a rather routine--and unvarying--follow-up exercise to review student

and administrator satisfaction with its initial preparation programs. However, several problems attend these follow-up studies.

For example, there was no apparent evidence that follow-up studies relate to or reflect the professed goals and knowledge base of the professional education program. Given the lack of College and unit long-range planning, goals articulation, and shared mission, the results of follow-up studies could hardly be linked to where the College/unit sees itself heading. If, for example, technologically enhanced instruction is to be important, some plan indicating that and follow-up studies reflecting that seem to be logically linked expectations. Moreover, and even more fundamentally, if the College/unit alleges to pursue the preparation of school leaders as a driving focus for its programs, follow-up studies must assess the extent to which that goal is recognized by its graduates and those who employ them. Follow-up studies are to no avail if they are decontextualized and not fed back into a systematic plan for program improvement and renewal. There can be no context without a plan, a mission, a set of goals and directions.

Of special importance here is the issue of responding to "Blueprint 2000" in the professional education programs. This appears to be a highly generalized, floating, and ungrounded goal for the College of Education, and even more so for the unit as a whole. Relatedly, the College/unit must be cited for weaknesses in preparing its future professionals for roles in multicultural settings. This goal has yet to be even espoused as a guiding objective for future program planning. However, it should be. It would logically follow, then, that any future assessments of program effectiveness must reflect this priority.

The following objectives are offered as being fundamental to success in NCATE accreditation--if not to the successful articulation and management of any unit which is in the business of preparing professionals for the world of practice, NCATE notwithstanding: (l) shared goals and missions; (2) a recognizable, program-impacting knowledge base (or bases) for each program in the unit; (3) coordinated, articulated governance structures to direct and assess how program goals are met; (4) systematic, sustained, and serious follow-up studies of program graduates.

Adequately addressing these objectives accomplishes several salutary benefits within a College/unit. For one, it necessitates widespread involvement in the articulation, delivery, and assessment of a shared vision. Secondly, it creates a culture of College/unit citizenship and shared, vested interests in the health of a College/unit. Such vested interests transcend the advocacy of what faculty see as "ruggedly individualistic" contributions which may be limited to what one's own program area can accomplish. Third, pursuit of such objectives per force increases dialogue, joint planning, and collegial, meaningful programmatic assessments which could in turn guide future resource allocations and program design. Finally, doing all it takes to ensure accreditation success can improve faculty morale.

Such objectives and benefits have yet to be realized at Florida State University. As a result, much needed opportunities for a culture which could be improved by shared vision, planning, and assessment have been obviated.

Certainly, the foregoing discussion addresses the major concerns. Three additional concerns of significantly less scope and impact are as follows:

(l) Data provided by the College of Education indicate that, over the past three years, teaching assistants and part-time faculty have taught more than 20% of the courses offered. The count of course sections taught by other than full-time faculty could be even higher, and these data do not appear to include faculty in professional education programs outside the College of Education.

(2) Governance, planning, and assessment of the Panama City programs is evidently conducted rather independently of the main campus. Neither the Council on Teacher Education nor the Teacher Education Advisory Committee include Panama City representation.

(3) What programmatic definition and articulation (eg: knowledge base, program model, etc.) that has been done has focused too exclusively on basic preparation (generally undergraduate) programs. Advanced programs have not been systematically designed in any coordinated manner.

**Recommendations**

Adequately and comprehensively addressing NCATE Category One standards, especially Standard I-A, must become a priority. The College and the unit should rethink its knowledge base and program model. (In so doing, the College/unit may wish to reconsider whether it is realistic to promulgate one model and one knowledge base for all programs). Whatever knowledge base(s) or model(s) that may be retained or developed must be clearly reflected in program design, delivery, and assessment.

The Professional Education Unit must become more clearly defined, more effectively operational, and it must broaden its governance roles and responsibilities. Through more

meaningful and active organization, mission and vision must be developed, articulated, disseminated, and monitored; comprehensive and goals-driven program planning and resource allocation must be pursued; and program assessment through follow-up studies must become the driving forces in curriculum development and revision. This should include the Panama City campus, and incorporate more involvement of public school teachers and administrators.

The inter-relationship of these first two recommendations must be stressed.

The College of Education should seek ways to pursue a sense of "college citizenship" and true collegiality among its faculty--a collegiality and pursuit of quality which extends beyond program areas. Departments must work together toward common, meaningful goals. For this to happen, faculty must be encouraged and enabled to see common benefits to improving the

overall health of the College. Again, establishing and planning toward common goals and visions is fundamental.

The College/unit must *appropriately* address the goals of "Blueprint 2000," and other planning documents and directives from state agencies and governing bodies. By no means should state-driven agendas, planning documents, and missions exclusively guide the directions of this College. Programs should not be planned to address only external goals and objectives, nor merely to pursue broad, system-wide missions and policies. Thoughtful consideration of how external goal setting can best be incorporated into College and unit plans is the key. Otherwise, ostensible mandates can be used to impede progress (or used to excuse a lack of progress) toward curriculum reform in keeping with the directions a College of this size and accord should be establishing internally.

At the same time, FSU does operate within a system, and is expected to address agency-driven (DOE) and system-driven (SUS) plans. Finding the proper balance between autonomous, future-oriented, and institutionally sensitive planning and what must be done to remain in compliance with external goal-setters is difficult. It is the view of this consultant, however, that this balance is achievable. Addressing the first three recommendations in this report may serve as the starting points.

# FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

**April 9-12, 1995**

## General Overview and Introduction

Florida Atlantic University (FAU), is a rapidly growing regional institution with a strong reliance upon and commitment to preparing professionals for schools. The College of Education (COE), as the center of the professional education unit, coordinates programs on several campuses and offers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. FAU has recently invested in two new education facilities which are contemporary and comfortable.

Based upon observations made during this National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education/Florida Department of Education/Board of Regents (NCATE/DOE/BOR) joint review, there are three increasingly important tensions facing FAU's College of Education. The first and most obvious of these is caused by rapid enrollment growth in a fiscal environment which has yet to provide sufficient funding for new positions. A second and related tension is caused by the encouragement towards greater and greater enrollment versus the need to provide programs of the highest possible quality. A third tension which has yet to be fully resolved pertains to administrative organization. The administrative coordination of multiple campuses creates complications, both within the COE and the University. An improvable governance structure for the professional education unit creates similar administrative challenges and tensions at FAU.

The impact of these three tensions permeates the following report. The concluding recommendations will likewise reflect these three tensions facing FAU and its College of Education.

## Commendations: Signs of Health and Vitality

There is much to praise in FAU's College of Education. This section focuses on six areas of excellence, positive trends, and praiseworthy practice.

1. Vision. The College of Education at FAU is not standing still. A healthy blend of new initiatives, such as the Teacher Education Alliance and the Genesis program, and more established activities, such as the Network for Community Education, is evident.

The Teacher Education Alliance is especially promising. The potential for legitimate collaboration among three groups of partners--public school, community college, and FAU faculty--is already evidenced. FAU's sound planning with the Broward County Schools should receive increased positive attention.

The Genesis Teacher Education Project and the related Genesis Academy for Teaching Excellence (GATE) are similarly progressive and innovative. The Genesis curriculum provides a bold variation on extended preparation programs with its ambitious promises to provide K-12 preparation, a major in a liberal arts or science area, and certification in "varying exceptionalities." The simultaneous development of the GATE schools, an effort at once consistent with "Blueprint 2000" goals and the national emergence of professional development schools, is equally promising.

The Center for Community Education and the related networking of outreach activities it offers is the most conspicuous of FAU's several examples of state and regional service. A search for the next recipient of the Charles Stewart Mott Professorship in Community Education is currently underway.

2. Commitment to Students. In many institutions, increased enrollment and flat budgets have had very negative consequences for the quality of student services provided. Such does not appear to be the case at FAU generally, and within the College of Education particularly. Undergraduate students are especially positive about the quality of advising they receive. The professional and support staff in the Office of Academic Student Services, though quite extended due to escalating enrollments, joins an equally extended faculty in demonstrating a commitment to quality advising and student welfare.

3. The College of Education Advisory Council. The COE Dean's efforts to engage diverse stakeholders in dialogue about professional teacher education are highly commendable. Discussions with members of this broadly representative group of business, civic, community, and educational leaders in the region convinced program reviewers of this Council's committed engagement, legitimacy, and potential value to the College of Education. This group's good works will ultimately benefit the community and region, and help lend credence to the Dean's expressed devotion to collaboration.

4. Improving Governance. FAU's governance structure appears on paper to be awkward at best, if not unworkable. Lines of administration show the Dean reporting directly to the Provost--and directly to the Vice Presidents of the three main campuses. This situation is reported to be a product of state-legislated budgeting procedures. Though theoretically and graphically questionable, this organization (which FAU admits is still far from perfect) is both generally workable and improving. Whether and how it can be sustained has yet to be determined. Nonetheless, an apparent spirit of cooperation has thus far allowed for good articulation up and down the line(s). In a period of constrained resource options, this is even

more praiseworthy. Awareness that potential tensions must be addressed at all levels seems likely to ensure continued refinements and clarifications, along with increased efficiency.

5. The Dean as Advocate. The COE Dean is an effective advocate on many major issues affecting the quality of professional education at FAU. It is easy to see how much more could have been done to improve program quality if the COE had been granted faculty lines commensurate with its enrollment growth. It takes more careful scrutiny to see the ways in which the Dean and his administration have made the best uses of the resources which have been available, how the COE administration has fought as hard as possible for "new" resources, and how effectively the Dean has established himself as the administrator in education for all the university's campuses. The fact that major capital outlays for new education facilities have been directed toward teacher education speaks at once to its centrality in the university's mission and at the same time to the university's confidence in the COE's future.

6. Curriculum Initiatives in Existing Programs. In addition to the promising new programs mentioned above, improvements to existing programs and curricula are ongoing. The COE's well-documented efforts to integrate multicultural education through an infusion strategy is positively noted. A good array of courses in English as a Second Language will improve preparation of both pre-service and in-service teachers for teaching in linguistically diverse schools. A strong program in Exceptional Student Education (ESE) helps ensure that FAU teacher education graduates are prepared to meet the needs of learners across a broad array of exceptionalities.

**Progress since Last BOR Report and Efforts to Address Other BOR Concerns**

The BOR consultant's report which followed the 1991 review included five recommendations. Of these, four appear to have been fully or partially addressed.

1. The Department of Teacher Education has devoted four new faculty lines to providing needed expertise in secondary education pedagogy. Whereas this has helped to return some "responsibility" for secondary education to the College of Education, the more general concern expressed in 1989 has not been adequately addressed, as following discussions will indicate.

2. Though a "unit on exceptionalities" is included in a two-week *pre-student teaching* orientation for secondary education students, not all students who enroll in the "certification only" sequence actually student teach. Hence, the only exposure to strategies for dealing with exceptionalities such students receive is in the context of other courses in the certification track. Such exposure appears to be minimal and highly variable.

3. The College has succeeded in appropriately differentiating between undergraduate and graduate faculty teaching loads, and has in fact taken the institutional lead in the endeavor to more specifically identify graduate faculty and graduate faculty standards.

4. A plan for faculty development was recommended in the 1989 report to the BOR, and this need has been addressed. In an increasingly systematic manner, the COE has invested in and organized a variety of faculty development activities, including seminars, funds for professional travel, and so forth. Ongoing development of strategies to assist the continuing scholarship of beginning faculty should be sustained.

5. One 1989 recommendation has not been satisfactorily addressed. The COE was encouraged to "consider...field experiences in secondary methods courses." A review of

course syllabi for the secondary methods courses reveals that most do not yet include a field component. One specific reference to a methods course field component was in the LAE 4360 syllabus for the Language Arts methods course which states that, "Each student will visit a language arts classroom and report on the lesson observed."

The most germane findings related to other BOR concerns include the following:

1. Credit hours to degree. This is a complicated issue and one related to other organizational and governance concerns to be addressed below. Hours required for completing certification in the music education and art education programs are relatively fixed, and both are at least eight hours in excess of the 128-hour maximum. Completing *degree* requirements in secondary school content areas such as English, social studies, mathematics, and the sciences *does not systematically or consistently account for the hours required for teacher certification.* The practice is for students to complete degree requirements in another college, and then to add on courses to meet state certification requirements. These additional requirements may include both additional course work in the academic field, and the required core courses in teacher education. Even with the judicious use of elective hours and flexible "course substitution policies" in the academic majors, the course work needed to complete certification requirements is well in excess of 128 hours. Although in current practice secondary certification requirements are not included in existing degree programs, the hours for completion issue for prospective secondary teachers is quite problematic at FAU.

2. Pass rates on Teacher Education Subject Area Examinations. Elementary education majors do well consistently, with close to a 100% passing rate over the past few years. Pass rates for future mathematics teachers (in the 70% range) and for middle grade general science

(at 60% or less from the last two reportings) are less positive, though the relative number of students taking these exams is small.

3. Minority representation. The College of Education appears to have made steady progress in recruiting minorities. The BOR Addendum indicates that 17.22% of the 3,002 students in the College of Education in 1994 were minorities (p. 5), though a subsequent table (p. 7) reports a total minority enrollment of 273 students--or approximately 9.1 percent. Nonetheless, using data provided by the institution, this represents a gain of about five percent in minority enrollment since 1991 when 110 (or 4.4 percent) minority students were counted among the COE's 2,476 total enrollment. The greatest minority enrollment gains have been among Blacks and Hispanics.

4. Addressing Critical Shortage Areas. The COE appears to have done well in increasing FTE productivity in its Exceptional Student Education programs as documented in the BOR Addendum (p. 8). However, the increase in program completers (from 34 to 51 at the undergraduate level and from 60 to 75 at the graduate level from 1991 to 1994) is modest.

Over the last three years, the COE has enrolled relatively low numbers of prospective foreign language (20), mathematics (32) and science (32) teachers in its non-degree certification programs. Moreover, of those enrolled, an indeterminate number finish all courses required for certification (and student teach) before obtaining their first teaching position.

5. Other issues of interest to the BOR: (a) The Master of Arts in Teaching and the Master of Science in Teaching are offered outside the College of Education, with little input from the COE. Student enrollment is normally not high and not all students in those programs pursue teacher certification. However, the COE's lack of involvement is



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

noteworthy. (b) The COE no longer offers degrees in secondary education fields, although graduates from those programs are still reported. (c) Upper division credit hours for degree programs are acceptable, as are the general data on timely completion of programs. (However, issues related to both upper division hours and time to completion change dramatically when the non-certification add-on is factored in).

**Areas of Concern**

Five areas of general concern arose from this joint review visit. The first four--use of part-time faculty; unit governance; program planning; and avenues for faculty input to the Dean--are presented below in order of significance. A fifth issue, the COE's ongoing attention to NCATE standards, is broader, more generic, and more multi-faceted. It is therefore difficult to place the NCATE issue in a prioritized ordering of concerns.

However much might be said about managing available resources and continuing to serve students well, the COE's heavily reliance on part-time faculty is a critical issue. One calculation of FTE's indicates the COE is generating enrollment sufficient to justify an additional *20 to 30 full-time faculty.* In 1992-93, the COE reported that 28% of all course sections were taught by part-time faculty. In 1993-94, the reliance on part-timers was up to 37%. For the current academic year, *over **40%** of all course sections offered by the COE will have been taught by part-time faculty.* These percentages do not include part-time faculty engaged only in supervision. Program quality, coherence, and continuity have been increasingly difficult to maintain. Both students and faculty report concerns about the heavy reliance on part-time faculty, even though both groups attest that some part-timers are very

well qualified, conscientious, and prepared. Nonetheless, even given the COE's best efforts to prepare part-timers and monitor their work, this situation has gone beyond the critical stage.

Class size is a related issue in that it, too, is a product of enrollment versus personnel resources. Faculty and students cited frequent instances of excessive class sizes at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

The College of Education and its executive council, which is offered as the unit's governing body, are not sufficiently responsible for nor adequately engaged in collaborations with all programs and components in professional teacher education. The significance of this problem goes well beyond merely being out of compliance with the NCATE concept of unit governance.

Specifically, though music education is not a program offered in the College of Education, accountability for this program should be of some official and organizational concern to the College of Education. The same can be said for secondary education programs. It is one thing to have other colleges grant degrees future teachers receive; it is quite another matter altogether for there to be such an apparently egregious lack of any systematic collaboration, joint planning, and dialogue between those colleges and the COE.

It is too easy for the COE to say, "they are not our students." It is too easy for the other colleges to say, "teacher education is the COE's concern." It is too easy for both groups to claim the other is uncooperative. In the meantime, there are significant numbers of students--estimated to be over 200--charting their own rather independent and idiosyncratic paths through add-on certification. This situation would be even more random were it not for the very best efforts of a highly competent advisor whose unenviable duty it is to identify,

advise, and monitor these "non-degree certification" students. As noted above, some students take only enough "certification stuff" to be minimally acceptable to local schools who are especially quick to offer jobs to graduates in science and mathematics. ("Minimally acceptable" should not be taken to mean that such students are ever required to complete student teaching). It is both ironic and predictable that the largest percentages of students are somewhere on the path to becoming English and social studies teachers.

The College of Education has no regular means of input into the quality and appropriateness of non-degree students' subject area course work. Conversely, faculty in the content areas have no formal voice at all, and no means of ongoing collaboration, in COE curriculum planning, implementation, evaluation, or improvement.

A third area of concern is the nature of academic planning in the COE. The Dean has offered that there are four characteristics which currently describe FAU's College of Education: growth, innovation, collaboration, and technology. Two important characteristics --focus and quality--could enhance this profile, and thereby improve FAU's already positive role in the region and state.

One example of growth without focus is the COE support of a "Masters Plus" program for baccalaureate degree holders who want to become elementary teachers. The College is rightfully proud of a soundly conceptualized, highly productive, four-year elementary education program. Regional and state supply and demand for elementary teachers does not suggest that more need to be prepared--especially by an institution that is already producing ample numbers.

On the other hand, as pointed out above, FAU is not producing many science, math, and foreign language teachers, even if one counts those who enter teaching before completing the certification program. Even more significant is the fact that FAU is not currently producing secondary teachers through a sound and defensible degree program. And, as suggested above, FAU's productivity of teachers specializing in exceptionalities is not particularly impressive.

When the budget driven quest for numbers is the primary concern directing "growth" and "innovation," academic program planning which takes into account the needs of school districts may be lost. (Paradoxically, in the case of secondary education, significant enrollment--and, even more importantly, much of the responsibility for quality--has been assumed by other colleges.)

A fourth concern relates to collaboration, one of the Dean's four descriptors of the College of Education mentioned above. Collaboration with outside constituencies is strong, as has already been pointed out, and there are generally appropriate and active committee structures for faculty in the COE. Yet, even given the already expressed need for greater collaboration with other colleges involved in the preparation of secondary teachers, the COE seems to lack another equally important element of collaboration.

Faculty access to the Dean, and the Dean's current structures for seeking direct advice and counsel from the faculty, seems limited. This concern is of particular import in regard to program planning and resource allocation. Faculty are not directly involved in "big picture" discussions, apparently communicating "through the chair" or being engaged only in curriculum decisions (decisions which one might judge to be out of the context of any broad program planning).

The final field of concerns relates to the COE's lack of *continuous* attention to NCATE standards and its failure to adequately capitalize on the potential benefits of preparing for the continuing accreditation review. More attention to NCATE's language and expectations relative to unit governance would have made it more difficult for the COE to abdicate certain programmatic responsibilities. Having a plan in place for recruiting minority faculty would have resulted from careful attention to faculty standards. Understanding the NCATE expectation of a demonstrably vital and dynamic knowledge base, whether for each program or for the unit as a whole, would have been derived from ongoing attention to Category One standards. Similarly, NCATE's variously expressed thematic and cross-cutting expectation of collaboration with content area faculty in the design and delivery of specialty studies might have been ongoing had the relevant NCATE standards been addressed. Knowing that the content preparation of teachers is expected to exceed a state's minimum standards in terms of coherence, coordination, and mastery would have resulted from continuous attention to the specialty studies standard and criteria.

Although it is true that the COE did succeed in eliminating some weaknesses cited in the 1989 NCATE report, new areas of concern emerged relative to the standards. Had the College of Education been more consistently attentive to NCATE standards over the past five years, several of the suggestions for improving existing programs and governance structures would, in all likelihood, already have been implemented.

## Recommendations

1. The College of Education must be supported in drastically reducing the number of part-time faculty it is forced to hire. Efforts must also be made to reduce class size. A nine-hour teaching load for graduate faculty who are not *extensively* involved in research should be considered. A twelve-hour teaching load for undergraduate faculty, provided class sizes are reasonable and no more than two preparations are required, would also help decrease reliance on part-time faculty and perhaps serve to decrease class size. However, it must be stressed that internal policies alone cannot adequately compensate for the lack of full-time faculty lines.

2. The governing body for the unit should be expanded to include representatives from *all* FAU program and subject matter areas which prepare or contribute significantly to the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. Members of this new governing body should be appointed by the Provost upon the recommendations of the appropriate Deans or department chairs.

The College of Education should consider appropriate means by which it can regain more direct responsibility for and control of secondary education. A fifth-year certification and degree program, one which should be dependent upon completion of an M.Ed. or an equivalent degree, should be considered for students who earn undergraduate degrees in a secondary school subject area. Such a program should increase, not decrease, the need for collaboration with other colleges, and should be the exclusive means by which future secondary teachers gain certification. Special efforts should be made to recruit mathematics and science teachers into whatever new configuration FAU designs for secondary education.

3. Even given the pressure to increase enrollment, no school, college or department of education can afford to be all things to all people. Nor can schools, colleges, and departments of education, operating in good faith, increase resources and faculty dedicated to the production of teachers who will be unable to find employment. Focused, quality driven, and thoughtfully responsible program planning should reflect local, regional, and state needs. This may mean that FAU provides fewer resources for preparing teachers in over-supplied fields such as elementary and social studies education while simultaneously seeking quality-driven ways to prepare more teachers in under-supplied areas such as special education, mathematics, and the sciences.

4. The College of Education Dean should establish the internal equivalent of the external College Advisory Council. Such a council should have input into budgetary and program planning deliberations in a more broadly representative *unit* which becomes responsible for professional education at FAU. It is also suggested that this unit be comprised of elected faculty; that it serve the Dean in an advisory role; and that it operate under a title such as, "Dean's Council for Planning and Resource Allocation."

# UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

**April 23-26, 1995**


57

## General Overview and Introduction

The University of South Florida (USF) is a rapidly growing, comprehensive, urban institution currently enrolling approximately 36,000 students. The College of Education presents itself as "the largest urban college of education in the nation." Enrollment in the College (COE) has kept pace with the rapid general growth at USF. The College of Education estimates 1994-95 FTE at 2,340, or 12.6% of the University total. The College is organized into eight departments, offers programs on eight campuses, and is committed to "improving the schools of today and inventing the schools of tomorrow." College and university goals are well-integrated, forward-seeking, and appropriate for the region and state.

From all appearances, the College of Education was well prepared for the joint accreditation visit, and provided good evidence that it had endeavored to address National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Florida Department of Education (DOE), and Board of Regents (BOR) expectations in a continuous manner. There was general evidence that the professional education unit at USF had, for the most part, addressed weaknesses revealed during the 1990 NCATE accreditation. In addition, NCATE reviews of annual reports, and preliminary preparation for Department of Education program reviews combined to indicate the COE's ongoing effort to improve its programs.

Following a review of BOR core accountability considerations and a discussion of several strengths and exemplary practices, this report will discuss concerns and offer recommendations. Several of the concerns to be discussed result from budgets which have not kept pace with enrollment in what remains, nonetheless an overall healthy, vital, and productive College.

**BOR Accountability Issues**

The College is monitoring and improving students' timely completion of Baccalaureate Studies. As subsequent points will reveal, the College provides excellent services to schools. Minority enrollment is increasing. The College is attempting to attract potential elementary education majors (of which there is an abundance) into special education but is having little success in drawing students to this critical shortage area. Productivity of science teachers is not high.

An ad-hoc committee in the College is considering "Blueprint 2000" ramifications, though faculty involvement and awareness do not seem to be high, and programs do not seem to reflect primary "Blueprint" thrusts. One particular example of this is revealed in the resultant concern with technology to be discussed below. Given their conspicuous strength in the College, several institutes and centers will similarly be discussed in what is to follow.

One area of concern to the BOR has not been satisfactorily resolved. Problems remain in acceptable credit-hour-to-degree ranges, though a detailed 2/21/95 memorandum was drafted to explain issues related to the excessive credit hour problem. (The memo is included in the USF Report to the BOR.) The memo goes to considerable length in explaining why the problems exist, but offers much less in the way of solutions. For reasons detailed in this memo, it is, in reality, indeed very hard to predict just how long it will take students to graduate, and, in many cases, even how many hours will be required.

The memo points out that generally students in "most...programs" can complete them in "120-125 hours." Doing so, however, requires virtually perfect planning from the freshman year on and allows for few if any deviations from prescribed courses of study. Though this is

generally true for students in all programs, it is especially problematic for community college transfers. Of those, the problem is particularly exacerbated for students who enter elementary education from the community colleges with Associate of Arts (AA) degrees. These students typically must take as many as 135 hours.

The 2/21/95 memo addressing this issue declares that "...it is unlikely this situation will change in the near future" if quality, state approved programs are to be maintained.

Community college articulation seems to be improving, with a 1991 Memorandum of Understanding guiding that articulation. However, there is still some cause to question just how much flexibility, cooperation, or acceptance the College demonstrates toward community colleges at the operational level. The response to the problem community college transfers face in entering the elementary education program would seem to justify that question.

## Areas of Commendation

Most programs and colleges of education reveal more areas of concern than areas of strength. Such is not the case at USF given the evidence considered for this review. No review process can hope to reveal all the weaknesses and strengths which may exist. Even knowing, then, that the following discussion is incomplete, the many areas to be commended are nonetheless impressive.

Centers and Institutes. The vitality of several centers was explored. These included the Children's Center; the Anchin Center for School Reform; the Institute for At Risk Infants, Children, Youths, and Their Families; the Stavros Center for Economic Education; and the National Research Center for Middle Grade/High School Education. As a group, these institutes and centers have been very successful in generating external funding. Each has a

demonstrable link to and impact upon education, with the scope ranging from pre-school to adult. Each contributes to the instructional and research vitality of the COE, and each is under the leadership of very capable, committed, and well-supported directors.

There has been a history of strong college support for and belief in creative, focused centers and institutes. That continuing support should keep a cadre of very talented and productive leaders and directors at USF for some time.

Support staff and college administration. The quality of department chairs and associate deans in the COE, including those who serve the branch campuses, is impressive. Leaders have emerged and evidently been nurtured for important positions throughout the college. At each level--from the Dean's Office, to the departmental level, to supporting areas--responsibilities seem clear. A number of administrative support persons contribute to the COE's administrative strength and efficiency. The counseling and advising staff is excellent. The addition of a development position in the college is already beginning to pay dividends. Being able to fund directors for the Alternative Teacher Preparation Program, for the exemplary Suncoast Area Teacher Training Program (SCATT) program, and for program reviews has insured quality and continuity. The quality of secretarial and support staff throughout the college is very high. In sum, a high quality administrative and support staff gives every appearance of routinely pooling individual strengths to address common problems and to move programs forward.

Quality of Undergraduate Students. Students in USF's College of Education speak very highly of their programs and faculty. This assessment is based on impromptu conversations and interviews as well as large group interview opportunities for which some preparation was

probably made. The average grade-point average (GPA) for native students is better than a 3.0, and USF students do very well on standardized tests required for certification. Undergraduate teacher education students impressed this observer as being very bright, enthusiastic, committed, energetic, and confident. Those qualities seem to be carried through to the world of practice. Supervising teachers, administrators, and faculty outside the College of Education have an obvious high regard for graduates of USF's teacher education programs.

Planning. USF's College of Education has recently framed a "Mission, Philosophy, and Goals" statement. The six operational goals are contemporary, well focused, and reflected in other documents which describe the COE's various programs. A comprehensive philosophy outlines 17 beliefs with operational definitions where appropriate. Goals--and related indicators and sub-goals--are related to instruction (including attention to dynamic knowledge bases); research; and professional service. Sound goal-setting is demonstrated. If progress toward implementation is monitored regularly, it should prove to be an effective document for guiding and assessing the COE's future course.

A recently developed "White Paper" framing issues, questions, and potentials for doctoral programs provides further evidence that the COE's faculty and administration have cast an eye to the future. The proactive, anticipatory, and self-questioning nature of the doctoral program white paper is already generating significant dialogue throughout the COE. The product of that dialogue should ultimately be even stronger and more thoughtfully planned doctoral programs.

Continuous attention to accreditations and program reviews. As mentioned in the introduction, one gets the sense that, for the right reasons, accreditation is taken seriously in

USF's College of Education. The administrative support which is critical to success is evident. So too, is the belief that accreditation is a means to an end--the end being to honestly assess and improve programs. Hence, for USF more than for many institutions, accreditation reports, documentation, and preparation are viewed as necessary and generally positive experiences. Most faculty appear to be happily on board the ship which presents itself through well-prepared documents, interview schedules, and logistics.

A healthy College of Education culture. This commendation relates to and proceeds from the last: despite restricted budgets, there is an aura of good feeling throughout this college, a subtle *esprit de corps*. This is not a reality that specifically addresses any standard; rather, it is a reality that enables the unit to apparently work together in harmonious, productive, and efficient ways--to do all that accreditation standards do require. Of course, unhappy campers in USF's College of Education could be sought out. Faculty are frustrated and concerned by recent budget realities. Some good faculty have left, and some of the good faculty remaining are undoubtedly looking to better themselves by leaving. (Other excellent faculty of some considerable tenure continue to be securely and happily devoted to USF). All things considered, the conditions of work in the COE, even given sometimes alarming teaching and advising loads, appear to be propitious. This is, for the most part, an especially positive and productive faculty.

Service dimensions. The USF College of Education faculty is highly and consistently visible in the world of practice. Public school teachers and administrators hold this faculty in high esteem. The service commitments of the centers and institutes have already been mentioned. The early, thoughtful planning of emerging professional development schools

(PDS) suggests substance and focus to collaborative intentions as opposed to the mere trendiness the acronym PDS may engender elsewhere. Planning a new public school on the USF campus will lead to connections which are even more directly observable. A healthy portion of faculty research is field-based, and collaborative projects for pre-service and for in-service teachers are reflected throughout faculty vitae.

The Suncoast Area Teacher Training Program (SCATT). This nationally recognized and widely praised program continues to earn its laurels. Approximately 40% of the COE's undergraduates qualify for and elect to join this organization which is designed to enhance pre-service education. The "extra mile" approach used to recruit students has created an aura of pride among program participants as they engage in seminars, enriched clinical experiences, and personal self-development--almost all of which is done on the students' time and by student choice. (The only exceptions is the SCATT-plus program which does offer elective credit for students who wish to delve more deeply into specified educational issues or research). This program enjoys truly dynamic leadership, and has become an important reason some students decide to become teachers at USF. The high vision and enthusiasm SCATT creates is a result of the quality, focused programs it offers for both pre-service and in-service teachers. With over 800 students currently on the SCATT roster, and many more times that many who are "SCATT alums," this program is justifiably likely to remain high profile in the Suncoast area it serves.

Institutional Commitment to Teacher Education. Teacher education is important to USF's central administration. Both the President and the Acting Provost seem to understand and be sensitive to the COE's needs. Accordingly, the COE has been given relatively equitable treatment as the University's insufficient budgets have been allocated. Money

already approved for a new education building and for renovation of the current structure suggests that professional education is a high university priority, and indicates that the University will expect the College of Education to remain very important to the overall institutional profile.

## Areas of Concern

The need for new faculty lines. Class sizes in College of Education programs tend to be large. Faculty advising loads are very heavy, with some faculty advising over 150 undergraduates, while numerous others serve on more than twenty doctoral committees. Faculty assume both compensated and non-compensated overloads, sometimes manipulating hours reported for courses to disguise higher instructional loads. Supervisory loads during the student teaching semester are out of compliance, well in excess of the 18-to-1 ratio NCATE requires. Even given all this, the College of Education reports an increasing reliance on part-time and adjunct faculty who now teach almost 30% of all course sections. It is absolutely essential that the College of Education be given new faculty lines just as soon as possible. As good as programs are now--and they are still at a high quality--it will be virtually impossible to maintain that quality for much longer unless additional faculty are hired. Moreover, maintaining quality at the current level with the existing faculty assumes no increase in enrollment. In terms of workload, this faculty is at the breaking point and has been for some time. Relief in the form of new lines must be significant, and it must come very soon.

Technology. The College of Education is behind the times in terms of technology. Equipment is barely adequate and only minimally contemporary. Students are dissatisfied with how USF prepares them to use technology in instruction. (Students in physical

education are, however, a notable exception). The majority of faculty do not appear to use technologically enhanced instruction with any frequency. Support staff have only recently begun to make use of technology to improve record keeping and monitoring of students' progress.

College and Unit Governance. Three problems exist in College of Education governance. The first is that there is not a sufficiently broad governance group for overseeing, establishing, and approving policies for all professional education programs in the unit. Among College of Education committees are two which deal with curriculum issues, one at the undergraduate and master's levels, and one at the advanced graduate level. There is also a committee for articulation with the College of Arts and Sciences. However, there is no comprehensive, unit-wide forum or structure for addressing issues that may involve both undergraduate and graduate programs, nor which brings together representatives from all program areas, including those from other colleges. In short, the College lacks a centralized, broadly based forum for discussing unit-wide issues and policies.

The second governance concern arises from the fact that the College lacks a structure whereby faculty have direct access to the Dean. There is good faculty involvement at the departmental level. However, there is a clear lack of a more direct, formally organized and systematized structure for faculty input at the College level. As it is now, faculty must rely on department chairs to translate and deliver faculty concerns about budget, programs, priorities, and so forth to the Dean.

The third problem is that the College does not have a current handbook for faculty which describes policies, procedures, and governance. By-laws which do exist are out of date

and generally useless given growth and change in the College over the last decade. Meaningful by-laws, definitions of operational procedures, and clarifications of governance structures are much needed.

Graduate Programs. Both internal and external governance of graduate programs is perilously loose. As a result, non-degree students are allowed to take an unlimited number of graduate hours in the College of Education. There is no apparent tracking mechanism. The College of Education has not assumed responsibility for limiting the number of doctoral students a faculty member may serve. Policies designed to give graduate faculty load credit for doctoral advising are not at all uniformly enforced. The College's relationship with and responsibilities to the USF's centralized (but loosely governed) Graduate School are not clearly established. Policies for graduate faculty certification are clear and seem to be appropriate, and a sufficiently large number of faculty are qualified to sit on or chair doctoral committees. Nonetheless, doctoral committee loads are quite unevenly distributed.

"Non-SCATT" Exclusions. One reason SCATT exists is to enhance some of what is in the regular teacher education curricula. However, one also gets the sense that part of what SCATT compensates for is not in the regular pre-service curricula. When compared to other students in the program, SCATT participants express greater awareness of certain issues such as the use of technology, how to deal with child abuse, and drug education. However, there are other areas with which only SCATT students seem to have much preparation at all, including communication skills, dealing with parents, ethical behaviors, and certain legal issues. In addition, the student teaching experience seems to be both different and better for SCATT students. There is more time for preparation, more assistance available through

seminars and discussion groups, and so on. One may, on the one hand, applaud the strengths and virtues of the SCATT program, while at the same time advocate that much of what SCATT provides could and should be made available to all students in teacher education programs.

General maintenance of quality, rigor, and control. Graduate faculty advising loads are very heavy. College advisors are badly overworked. Department chairs and Dean's staff charged with monitoring and insuring program quality are struggling against the tide of larger and larger enrollments, and more and more programs. The excellence of the support staff and administrative team in the College of Education was rightfully praised above. On the other hand, the functions and purposes of some committees do not seem clear. For example, some believe the committee for articulating with the College of Arts and Sciences attends to general education, though committee members say they do not. Untracked and hence uncounted students enroll in graduate courses to pursue course-count certification. The average GRE score of 1104 reported for the COE's doctoral students (p. 18 of the NCATE Report) is at some considerable odds with the Graduate School's sense of COE doctoral student quality. These are examples of a management system which is stressed so much that clear communication between its various components is severely compromised. Though the College is by no means close to "system failure due to overload," slippage in quality control, administrative communication, and rigorous monitoring of students and programs is already apparent.

The need for follow-up studies. The use of follow-up studies to improve instruction is sparse. At the undergraduate level, there are regular employment surveys across programs,

and some program-specific efforts to solicit graduates' assessments once they have taken teaching jobs. At the graduate level, the picture is much worse--there is no evidence of any follow-up on graduates from the advanced programs. Hence, it is difficult for the College of Education to provide much persuasive evidence that the results of follow-up studies are systematically used to improve programs.

## Recommendations

Many of the following recommendations are implicit in the above statements of concerns and will therefore not be elaborated here:

1. Faculty lines in the College of Education should be increased as significantly and immediately as possible.

2. The uses of technology for instructional purposes, and the preparation of pre-service teachers to use technology should be improved. The College should consider the opportunity presented by the new building to move the College and its programs into the next century with sound, well-funded plans for and utilization of technology.

3. It is recommended that the Provost appoint (upon appropriate recommendations from the COE Dean) a university-wide council to monitor, to discuss, and to approve courses, curricula, and policies relevant to the preparation of professionals who work in schools.

It is further recommended: (1) that the College of Education elect a representative committee, perhaps to be called "The Planning, Resource, and Allocation Committee," which would serve in roles advisory to the Dean; (2) that the College of Education elect a representative "Faculty Affairs Committee" to also serve in roles advisory to the Dean; and (3) that the College create a "College/Faculty Handbook."

4. Clear and consistently enforced policies related to doctoral level advising loads should be established. A limit on the number of hours non-degree students may take at the graduate level should become policy, and courses taken by non-degree students should be monitored. More faculty should be developed and encouraged to share in doctoral program responsibilities, including both memberships and chairmanships. The roles and relationships of the graduate program coordinating body in the College of Education should be clearly articulated with those of the USF Graduate School.

5. The SCATT Program's enhancements and advantages should be extended to and required of all teacher education students in those cases where it is appropriate and possible to do so.

6. Follow-up studies which reflect the various programs' knowledge bases should be conducted. Evidences of how the results of the follow-up studies are used to improve programs should be documented.

7. Goal-specific and monitored planning with community colleges which specifically leads to strategies for reducing the number of hours required for community college transfers who enter the elementary education program should be implemented.

## A General Recommendation for State Universities in Florida

## A General Recommendation for State Universities in Florida

SUS institutions should be strongly encouraged toward and supported in their efforts to engage in *continuous* consideration and application of NCATE standards. Institutions should encourage faculty to become members of NCATE's Board of Examiners, not only for the knowledge to be gained regarding NCATE standards and procedures, but also to broaden awareness of the programs, challenges, and innovations which are part of other system and institutional cultures. Relatedly, SUS institutions would be very well served by participating in NCATE-sponsored sessions which have proven to be very effective in guiding preparation for continuing accreditation.

The point of these latter recommendations is not to have SUS institutions merely become "better at playing the NCATE game" as one (non-SUS) dean put it. Rather, it is to suggest how institutions can help themselves successfully address NCATE standards in a continuous manner. The "game," if it is to be called one, is a very crucial game. It is one which requires that institutions reflectively monitor and assess the vitality of dynamic curricula and engage in faculty development; plan for the future; exercise unit governance; and so forth. It is through the documented evidence of how units responsible for professional education continue to address NCATE standards that their quality can be judged and their improvement can be ensured. It is, therefore, not only a game well worth playing; it is a game worth playing well.

# Appendices

# APPENDIX A:

## Academic Degree Programs Inventory

## ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY

**FSU, USF, FAU, and UNF Education Programs Approved by the Board of Regents as of May 1995**

| CIP Codes | Degree Programs | FSU | USF | FAU | UNF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13.0301 | Curriculum & Instruction | | M D S | M D S | |
| 13.0401 | Ed Admin/Leadership, General | M D S | M D S | M D S | M D |
| 13.0406 | Higher Ed Administration | M D S | | | |
| 13.0501 | Ed Media/Instructional Systems (13.0601) | M D S | | | |
| 13.0603 | Ed Statistics & Research Methods | M D S | | | |
| 13.0604 | Ed Assessment, Testing & Measurement | M D S | | | |
| 13.0802 | Ed Psychology | M D S | | | |
| 13.0901 | Social Foundations of Ed | M D S | | M | |
| 13.1001 | Special Ed, General | M D S | B M | B M D | B M |
| 13.1004 | Ed of the Gifted & Talented | | M | | |
| 13.1005 | Ed of the Emotionally Handicapped | | B M | | |
| 13.1006 | Ed of the Mentally Handicapped | B M S | B M | | |
| 13.1009 | Ed of Blind & Visually Handicapped | B M S | | | |
| 13.1011 | Ed of Specific Learning Disabled | B M S | B M | | |
| 13.1101 | Counselor Ed/Student Counseling/Guidance | M D S | M | M S | M |
| 13.1201 | Adult & Continuing Teacher Ed | M D S | M | | |
| 13.1202 | Elementary Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | B M | B M |
| 13.1204 | Pre-Elem/Early Childhood Teacher Ed | B M D S | | M | |
| 13.1205 | Secondary Teacher Ed | | | | B M |
| 13.1295 | Jr. College Teaching (13.1206) | | M | | |
| 13.1302 | Art Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | M | B M |
| 13.1303 | Business Teacher Ed (Vocational) | | B M | | |
| 13.1305 | English Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | B | |
| 13.1306 | Foreign Languages Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | | |
| 13.1307 | Health Teacher Ed | B M | | | |
| 13.1308 | Home Economics Teacher Ed (Vocational) | B M | | | |
| 13.1311 | Mathematics Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | B | B M |
| 13.1312 | Music Teacher Ed | B M D | B M | B M | B M |
| 13.1314 | Physical Ed Teaching & Coaching | B M D S | B M | B M | B M |
| 13.1315 | Reading Teacher Ed | M D S | M | M | |
| 13.1316 | Science Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | B | B M |
| 13.1318 | Social Studies Teacher Ed | B M D S | B M | B | |
| 13.1320 | Trade & Industrial Teacher Ed (Vocational) | D S | B M | | B M |
| 13.1395 | Secondary Science/Math Teachng (13.1327) | B | | | |

B Bachelor's Degree
M Master's Degree
D Doctoral Degree
S Specialist's Degree

Limited Access
D Affiliated Doctoral Program
S Affiliated Specialist Program

D Degree-Granting Institution for a Cooperative Doctoral Program

# APPENDIX B:

## Teacher Education Joint Review Teams

## APPENDIX B-1

## UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
### Teacher Education Program Review Personnel

**BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Consultant**

Dr. David A. England
Louisiana State University

**BOR Staff**

Dr. R. E. LeMon
Director, Academic Program Review and Accountability

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Unit Review Team**

Dr. Carl Backman, Chair
University of West Florida

Dr. Carol Corcoran
Stetson University

Dr. Erskine Dottin
Florida International University

Dr. Wayne Fetter
Florida Southern College

Dr. Mary Ann Lynn
University of Central Florida

**DOE Staff**

Ms. Barbara C. Harrell
Program Specialist
Preservice Program Approval

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)**

**Board of Examiners**

Dr. Luiza B. Amodeo, Chair
Retired - Sonoma State University

Mr. Greg H. Matchett, Assistant Chair
Classroom Teacher - Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Marilyn E. Feldmann
Western Carolina University

Mr. Daniel L. Prinzig
Les Bois Junior High
Boise, Idaho

Dr. Richard Whelan
University of Kansas Medical Center

Ms. Teresa Logan
Florida Education Association/United

Ms. Ann H. Smith
Florida Teaching Professional/
National Education Association

**State Agency Consultant**

Dr. Clara Jennings
University of West Florida

## APPENDIX B-2

## FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
### Teacher Education Program Review Personnel

**BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Consultant**

Dr. David A. England
Louisiana State University

**BOR Staff**

Dr. R. E. LeMon
Director, Academic Program Review and Accountability

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Unit Review Team**

Dr. Mary Ann Lynn, Chair
University of Central Florida

Ms. Toni Bilbao
Florida International University

Dr. William Caldwell
University of North Florida

Dr. Donnie Evans
Hillsborough County School District

Dr. Nancy McAleer
Rollins College

Dr. Mary Topping
Polk County School District

**DOE Staff**

Ms. Barbara C. Harrell
Program Specialist
Preservice Program Approval

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)**

**Board of Examiners**

Dr. William I. Burke, Chair
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill

Dr. Linda Blanton
Appalachian State University

Mr. Lyndall R. Caddell
Noble Junior High
Norman, Oklahoma

Dr. Judy L. Genshaft
University of Albany, SUNY

Dr. Eddie R. Johnson
Alabama Department of Education

Dr. John M. Ritz
Old Dominion University

Ms. Merri Man
FEA Representative

## APPENDIX B-3

## FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
### Teacher Education Program Review Personnel

**BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Consultant**

Dr. David A. England
Louisiana State University

**BOR Staff**

Ms. D. J. Minear
Program Review Coordinator

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Unit Review Team**

Dr. Erskine Dottin, Chair
Florida International University

Dr. Wesley Little
University of West Florida

Dr. Robert Lemons
Florida A&M University

Dr. Larry Reed
Escambia County School District

**DOE Staff**

Dr. Thomas Hobbs
Program Specialist
Preservice Program Approval

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)**

**Board of Examiners**

Dr. James E. Cole, Chair
Associate Superintendent
Anoka-Hennepin School District
Coon Rapids, Minnesota

Dr. Dale G. Anderson
University of Las Vegas

Ms. Emma Palmer
Milwaukee Area Teacher College

Dr. I. Joyce Swartney
Buffalo State College

## APPENDIX B-4

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
### Teacher Education Program Review Personnel

**BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Consultant**

Dr. David A. England.
Louisiana State University

**BOR Staff**

Ms. D. J. Minear
Program Review Coordinator

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Unit Review Team**

Dr. Carl Backman, Chair
University of West Florida

Dr. Carol Corcoran
Stetson University

Dr. Robert Lemons
Florida A&M University

Dr. Mary Ann Lynn
University of Central Florida

Dr. Judy Olson
University of Central Florida

Dr. Robert Vos
Florida International University

**DOE Staff**

Ms. Barbara C. Harrell
Program Specialist
Preservice Program Approval

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)**

**Board of Examiners**

Dr. Dale Scannell, Chair
Indiana University/IU Pudue

Mr. Charles Bowyer,
NEA - New Mexico

Dr. Ray Davis
North Carolina A&T University

Dr. Sharon Elliott
Wayne State University

Dr. Brenda Wey
Appalachian State University

Ms. Jewell Wilburn
Grandview Elementary School
Charleston, West Virginia

Ms. Randi Biro
FEA United Representative
Miami, Florida

## APPENDIX C:

## Vita

## Dr. David A. England

## Board of Regents Consultant

***VITA***

**DAVID A. ENGLAND**
**College of Education**
**Louisiana State University**

Home: 729 Carriage Way
Baton Rouge, LA 70808
(504) 767-5680

Office: Louisiana State University
221 Peabody Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-4707
(504) 388-2208

Personal Data: Born - June 19, 1946; married; three daughters (25, 24, and 17); an avowed sports enthusiast with a sense of humor.

## ***ACADEMIC PREPARATION***

B.S. in Secondary Education, Indiana University, 1969.
M.S. in Secondary Education, Indiana University, 1973.
Ph.D. in English Education, Indiana University, 1976.

Dissertation: Development and Issues in Secondary English Instruction, 1935-1955: Progression, Regression, and the Search for the Ideal.

## ***EMPLOYMENT HISTORY***

July, 1994 to Present: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, undergraduate and graduate faculty. Administrative responsibilities include academic planning and programs, which involves serving as a liaison with the Graduate School, coordinating academic programs and schedules with the three departments, assisting the Dean with strategic planning, coordinating program evaluations, coordinating academic grade appeals, coordinating professional education programs, and monitoring and assisting Laboratory School articulation with other departments and programs; faculty affairs, which involves advising the Dean on all faculty personnel matters, coordinating paperwork on personnel hires and changes within the three departments, coordinating promotion and tenure processes in the Dean's office, monitoring College equal opportunity and affirmative action programs, heading efforts to recruit a culturally diverse faculty and student body, and coordinating and monitoring College committees; and other general duties which include serving as a liaison with local schools, assisting the Dean in preparing, monitoring, and executing College budgets, monitoring and coordinating Office of Student Services activities, representing the College in the Dean's absence, providing general service to the College, and performing other general duties designated by the Dean and the University central administration.

England

January, 1991 to June, 1994: Associate Dean for Teacher Education, and Associate Professor for Curriculum and Instruction, graduate and undergraduate faculty. Administratively responsible for the Office of Student Services, including Clinical Experiences, as well as college and university-wide administration and coordination of all matters pertaining to teacher education. This position, which grew out of the earlier position as Director of Teacher Education, has involved leadership in the development of new, fifth-year teacher education programs in the College of Education; implementation of alternative certification programs; administrative responsibility for NCATE preparation; and staffing, budget, and scheduling coordination with three department chairs in the college.

1988-1990: Coordinator of Teacher Education and Clinical Experiences, and Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, graduate and undergraduate education; a twelve month administrative appointment. Primary responsibilities included administering all pre-student teaching, student teaching, and post-graduate clinical experiences; coordinating program evaluation and revision in teacher education; directing College Holmes Group activity; directing the Louisiana Writing Project; supervising and coordinating the work of graduate teaching assistants.

January, 1984-1988: Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, graduate and undergraduate faculty, Louisiana State University specializing in English Education; Director of the Louisiana State University Writing Project..

1975-January, 1984: Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Human Resources and Education, at West Virginia University, with concentration in English Education ; promoted to Associate Professor with tenure 1979.

1980-1981: Summer faculty, Visiting Professor, New School for Social Research.

1973-1975: Graduate teaching assistant at Indiana University.

1969-1973: Teacher of English and department chair, football and baseball coach at Franklin, Indiana Senior High School.

## ***CURRICULUM AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT***

Chaired and coordinated committees which developed three fifth-year teacher education programs involving 42 new courses in seven academic departments.

Developed summer Institutes for Graduate credit related to the LSU and Louisiana Writing Projects.

Developed the course "American Television, Learning, and the Schools."

England

Offered six special topics courses for English teachers on such topics as evaluating student writing, teaching language, response-centered pedagogy in literature, and teaching contemporary fiction.

Designed four new courses for English teachers' Master's program.

Developed curriculum for middle school language arts certification.

Chaired committee which designed and implemented a new English teacher preparation curriculum.

## ***COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE***

Currently advisor for approximately two dozen graduate students; chair of three doctoral committees at present, and serving on an additional seven, Spring, 1995.

Member of the Advisory Council of the Division of Instructional Support and Development, 1994 to present.

Elected to LSU Faculty Senate, Fall, 1994.

Member of LSU Academic Affairs "Mentornet" Committee, 1994 to present.

Member of LSU Committee to explore "Alternative Career Paths for Instructors," 1994 to present.

Co-chair, Chancellor's Scholarship Committee, 1991-1992.

Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Instruction at Louisiana State University, 1987-1988.

Staff development consultant to two colleges at West Virginia University, 1984.

Chair of the West Virginia University Faculty Senate Welfare Committee, 1984.

Elected member of the Dean's Advisory Committee West Virginia University, 1982.

University Faculty Senate, West Virginia University, 1980-84.

Chair of 15 successfully defended dissertations; have served as a member of an additional 32 successfully completed doctoral programs in last twelve years.

England

***EXTERNAL FUNDING***

1995 - "Supporting Graduate Level Pre-Service Education for Secondary Mathematics and Science Teachers", Board of Regents LEQSF **$ 16,000**

1990 - United States Department of Education - Literacy Core **$ 30,000**

1989 - United States Department of Education - Literacy Core **$ 30,000**

1989 - "National Writing Project at Louisiana State University" **$ 282,000**
- East Baton Rouge Parish Schools $ 8,000
- Ascension Parish Schools $ 8,000
- St. Charles Parish Schools $ 12,000
- West Feliciana Parish Schools $ 4,000
- LA State Department of Education $ 250,000

1988 - "National Writing Project at Louisiana State University" **$ 52,000**
- East Baton Rouge Parish Schools $ 12,000
- Ascension Parish Schools $ 12,000
- St. Charles Parish Schools $ 22,000
- West Feliciana Parish Schools $ 6,000

1987 - "National Writing Project at Louisiana State University" **$ 50,000**
- East Baton Rouge Parish Schools $ 14,000
- Ascension Parish Schools $ 14,000
- St. Charles Parish Schools $ 22,000

1986 - "National Writing Project at Louisiana State University" **$ 36,000**
- East Baton Rouge Parish Schools $ 18,000
- Ascension Parish Schools $ 12,000
- West Feliciana Parish Schools $ 6,000

1985 - "National Writing Project at Louisiana State University" **$ 53,000**
- East Baton Rouge Parish Schools $ 20,000
- Ascension Parish Schools $ 12,000
- West Feliciana Parish Schools $ 6,000
- National Writing Project $ 15,000

***STATE AND REGIONAL SERVICE***

Developed Programmatic Definition for quality education in English and language arts which was entered as expert testimony in the "Recht Decision" (People of Lincoln County, West Virginia vs. the State of West Virginia), 1982.

England

Director of Kanawha County, West Virginia schools Basic Skills Project in English, language arts, and reading, 1979-1982.

Consultant/presenter to each of the eight counties in West Virginia participating in the West Virginia Writing Projects, 1978-1984.

Consultant/University Coordinator in the West Virginia University-Kanawha County Schools Teacher Corps Project, 1978-1982.

Program evaluator for NCATE (four times) and the West Virginia State Department of Education (three times) since 1978.

Presented over 200 state and local in-service and continuing education sessions for teachers and administrators on such topics as evaluating student writing; teaching writing in the content areas; teaching adolescent fiction; school-community relations; children's television' nurturing writing in the elementary schools; and research implications for public school classroom instruction, 1976-1990.

Consultant to West Virginia State Department of Education on a regular basis (teacher certification; program review, etc.), 1976-1984.

Invited speaker to over 100 parent, professional, or business groups and associations over last 14 years.

Past President of the West Virginia Council of Teachers of English.

Member of West Virginia Board of Regents Baccalaureate Degree Committee (to review and revise state undergraduate programs).

Consultant to Louisiana State Department of Education (involving several Bureaus and Programs).

Louisiana Coalition for Inclusive Education, 1991 to present.

## ***NATIONAL SERVICE***

Elected to the Holmes Group National Advising Board, 1995.

Manuscript reviewer for English International, 1994 to present.

Judge for NCTE National Writing Awards competition.

England

Manuscript reviewer for Urban Education, 1993 to present.

Chair of South Central Region Holmes Group Task Force on Accountability, 1990-present.

Trainer for NCATE Board of Examiners, 1990.

Board of Examiners team member and team chair for NCATE review, 1988 to present. (See attachment)

Member of National Council of Teachers of English-NCATE coordination committee, 1988 to present,

Member of Conference on English Education Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification, 1988 to 1990.

Referee/manuscript reader for College English, 1987-1989.

NCTE representative to NEA-Kodak "Cameras in the Classroom" Project, 1985.

Director NCTE Commission on Media (three year term, beginning in 1984).

Charter member of the NCTE Commission on Media, 1981-1984.

Advisor for Television Information Office, 1978-1982.

Participant in NCTE Co-sponsored Speakers Program, 1977-1978.

Chair of the NCTE Committee on Television Literacy, 1976-1980.

Representative for Action for Children's Television, 1976-1980.

## ***CONSULTING***

Curriculum and staff development consultant to 11 Louisiana school systems since 1986.

One of three principal members of an incorporated consulting firm (Macengfelt Associates, Inc.) which conducted six public school program evaluations, 1981- 1985.

Consultant and workshop presenter, Henrico County (VA) Schools Humanities Center, 1980 and 1981.

England

Curriculum evaluation consultant to school systems in Nashville, Tennessee; Howard County, Maryland; Monogahela County, West Virginia; Concordia Parish, Louisiana; and others, 1980 to present.

Editorial consultant and contributor to textbook series for Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Served as consultant to or director of curriculum development projects in 12 West Virginia counties.

Consultant to Florida Board of Regents (See attachment)

## ***SELECTED PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS***

"The Holmes Program As Alternative Certification," South Central Holmes Meeting, April, 1995.

"System-wide Planning for Minority Recruitment," at the Association of Teacher Educators Annual Conference, February, 1995.

"Recent Teacher Education Graduates--How Are They Doing? Experiences Teachers and Principals," American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, March 1993.

"Professional Self-Judgment: The established Family Judges its Newest Members" at the 1992 annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando.

(Various other presentations or papers for AERA. AACTE, and ATE Since 1990).

"Looking Up the River to Professional Development Schools," a paper commissioned by the Holmes Group, Houston, 1988.

"Merging Middle School Development and Adolescent Psychology" at the Spring Conference on English Education, Houston, TX, March, 1985.

"Television as Humanity" at the Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, Philadelphia, PA, 1984.

"The Future of Television, and a Vision of Television Education" for the North Carolina Principals' Association, Raleigh, NC, 1982.

"Thinking About How We Think About Responding to Student Writing" at the 1977 American Education Studies Association, Memphis, 1980.

England

"Teaching Teachers About Television" at the 1980 Southeastern Educational Leadership Conference, Orlando, FL.

Have appeared regularly on NCTE programs and on the programs of affiliated groups since 1973, with eight presentations or papers at annual conferences, six at conferences of the CEE, and others at regional conferences or those sponsored by special interest groups within NCTE.

Have appeared regularly at regional and national conferences of the Holmes Group since 1989.

## ***PUBLICATIONS***

"Lou LaBrant: A Visionary for the Ages," in Missing Chapters: Ten Pioneering Women in English Education, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, 1991.

"Knowing Students Through Their Writing" in the NASSP Bulletin, May, 1990.

"What to "Just Look For" in Language Arts Classes: Thoughts on Observing and Assessing," Alberta English, (Summer, 1989).

"Writing to Learn Algebra," School Science and Mathematics, (April, 1989).

"A Case Study--Of Censorship? Or of the Censored?." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, (Fall, 1988).

"Television as a Language Art-Seriously," Teaching English in the Two-Year College, (December, 1987).

"The Gift of Education May Be Too Easy: A radical Look at Compulsory Education and School Reform." Social Science Perspectives Journal, (October, 1987).

A chapter of proceeding from the November, 1984, Conference of the International Federation of Teachers of English, compiled and edited for Boynton-Cook Publishers for Fall, 1985.

with Joannis K. Flatley, "Homework and Why," a monograph for Phi Delta Kappa's "FASTBACK" series, Spring, 1985.

"Children and Television: Issues and Directions" a monograph for Phi Delta Kappa's "FASTBACK" series, Spring, 1984.

England

with Maia Pank Mertz, "Characteristics of Adolescent Fiction," by the School Library Journal, (October, 1983).

"An Interview with Bob Knight." Phi Delta Kappa, November, 1982.

"Needed: Health Skepticism About Obvious Research Findings." The American School Board Journal, June, 1981.

"A Survey of West Virginia University Freshman Composition Students." West Virginia Department of Education, September, 1981.

with J. Christopher Eisele, "Bait-Rebait." English Journal, October, 1981.

"Television and Politics--The Politics of Television: An Interview with David Halberstam." Media and Methods, October, 1980.

"Teaching and Viewing in the Eighties." English Journal, January, 1980.

"Television and the English Teacher." English Journal, November, 1979.

"Television and the English Teacher." English Journal, October, 1979.

"Four Books About Television." Media and Methods, October, 1979.

with Almasy, Rudolph. "Future Teachers as Real Teachers--Using Undergraduates in Writing Labs." English Eduction, Fall, 1979.

"With Grammar on my Left... English Teaching and the Second World War." English Journal, April, 1979.

with Judy, Stephen N., co-editors, "An Historical Primer on the Teaching of English." (Special thematic issue of English Journal), April, 1979.

"Objectives for Our Own Composing Processes-When We Respond to Students." In Classroom Practices and the Teaching of English, 1979-1990, Managing the Paperload, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, IL, 1979.

with DeCosta, Sandra B. "TV and Reading: Some Perspectives on the Either/Or Mentality." Proceedings of the 1979 Reading Center Conference, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, 1979.

"Television and the English Teacher." English Journal, December, 1978.

England

"Television and the Teaching of English: Some Questions and Answers." English Journal, September, 1978.

"Perspective in Teaching Literature." Dialogue, Winter, 1977-1978.

"Unplug the Book--Not the Set." Media and Methods, October, 1977.

"Hearing From the Teacher When Nothing is Wrong." English Journal, September, 1977.

"An Admittedly Negative Article (or, How We Might Teach Literature if We Changed Our Objectives). Missouri English Bulletin, January, 1977.

"Women in Advertisements: Exploring Roles and Images." In Classroom Practices in the Teaching of English, 1976-1977, Responses to Sexism, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, IL, 1976.

"Blurred Images: English Apostles, Middle America." English Education, Fall, 1976.

## ***CURRENT WORK***

Centers of Excellence in Teacher Education, a collection of case study descriptions of outstanding programs and policies in schools and colleges of education.

"Second Career Teachers: Implications for Teacher Education" for a collection of essays on second career teachers to be published by Corwin Press.

"Practicing Professionals' Assessments of Beginning Teachers" for Action in Teacher Education.

"A Hard Look at Alternative Certification," for the Journal of Teacher Education.

"Beyond Accreditation: Institutional Benefits of NCATE."